DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 475 EA 016 038

AUTHOR Reynolds, Diane
TITLE Accountability Structures in Managing State Education Agency Competency Based Education Programs.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; Compensatory Education; *Competency Based Education; Elementary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Remedial Programs; State Aid; State School District Relationship; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS Louisiana; *Louisiana Competency Based Education Law

ABSTRACT

This paper provides the background for and provisions of the accountability materials that were authorized by the Louisiana Bureau of Elementary Education to monitor schools' compliance with the Louisiana Competency Based Education Law. In order effectively to manage the two major components of the law--the Pupil Progression Plans and the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs--school districts were provided materials on a variety of areas. For the Pupil Progression Plans the materials included a guideline for pupil progression, a procedural format, a school-district checklist of steps for compliance, an evaluation instrument for local plans, training manuals, public information, and procedures for revision of the progression plans. For the Remedial Programs, a summary of state regulations was accompanied by procedures, formats, and applications for summer programs, class profile sheets in mathematics and language arts, checklists for compliance, training manuals, and instruments for measuring student skill levels. Feedback from local program staff was recorded, as well. (JW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED233475

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Diane Reynold

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACCOUNTABILITY STRUCTURES IN MANAGING STATE EDUCATION AGENCY COMPETENCY BASED EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Diane Reynolds
Bureau of Elementary Education
Office of Academic Programs
Louisiana State Department of Education

Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the
American Educational Research Association
Montreal, Canada
April, 1983

EA 016 038

Accountability Structures in Managing State Education
Agency Competency Based Education Programs

Background

The Bureau of Elementary Education within the Office of Academic Programs, Louisiana State Department of Education, was charged with responsibility for managing and implementing two major components of the Louisiana Competency Based Education Law (R.S. 17:24.4): Pupil Progression and State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs. Each local school system is required to develop annually a Pupil Progression Plan, which is the school system's comprehensive plan of all state and local policies and procedures for the placement of students, grades K-12. Included within each Pupil Progression Plan are the promotional policies that specifically address the State Basic Skills Test as the principal criterion for promotion. The second component is the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program that must be provided to each student who fails to achieve the minimum performance standard on the State Basic Skills Test in Language Arts and/or Mathematics. The State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program is an integral part of a local school system's Pupil Progression Plan.

The role of the Bureau of Elementary Education in the Accountability process was (1) to ensure that program regulations for Pupil Progression and State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program were developed and adhered to by the local school systems, and (2) to provide for coordination and communication between the Department of Education and the local school systems in a continual effort to improve the regulations which would subsequently improve the quality of the two programs.

In administering the above mentioned components, the Department made a conscientious effort to develop regulations and guidelines that adhered to the mandates specified in the law, yet were flexible enough to provide local school systems the autonomy to develop Pupil Progression Plans and State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs that would best meet the needs of the students within the individual systems. A major concern of the Department in the development of the regulations, guidelines, and implementing procedures was the merging of the State requirements and the local school systems' policies and criteria for student placement without lowering the standards of the local school system.

Based upon a statewide survey, it was determined that none of the 66 school systems within the State had a formally adopted Pupil Progression Plan that detailed the policies and procedures for the placement of students. The Department of Education therefore assumed the leadership responsibility in regard to the development and implementation of Pupil Progression Plans and State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs.

Rationale for Implementation

In order to effectively manage and administer these programs, it was imperative that guidelines, regulations, and implementing procedures be developed by the Department to assist local school systems in developing their Pupil Progression Plans and State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs. In addition it was necessary to provide training and evaluation tools for Department personnel who were responsible for providing technical assistance and evaluating the local Pupil Progression Plans to assure consistency throughout the State.

The following chart outlines the specific materials developed by the Department and specifies the purpose and use of the materials.

Figure 1. Outline of Pupil Progression Plans and State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs

Pupil Progression Plans

Material	Purpose	Authorized by *	Used by
1. Bulletin 1566, Guidelines for Pupil Progression	State Regulations based upon legislation for developing local plans	SBESE	SDE LEA
2. "Format for Pupil Progression"	a. Procedure for outlining and developing the local plan	SDE	LEA
	b. Evaluation tool in reviewing local plan	SDE	SDE
3. "Local School System Self-Checklist for Pupil Progression"	a. Method to ensure that all required components were included in the local Pupil Progression Plan	SDE	LEA
	b. Evaluation tool in recovering local plans	SDE	SDE
4. "Evaluation Instrument"	Evaluation of local plans	SDE	SDE
5. Training Manuals	To provide consistency in evaluating local plans	SDE	SDE
6. Brochure - "The Pupil Progression Plan, What It's All About"	Public Information	SDE	LEA
7. Procedures for Interim Revision	Method to change local plan prior to annual revision	SDE	LEA

* SBESE - State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education
LEA - Local Education Agency
SDE - State Department of Education

State Funded Compensatory Remedial Programs

Material	Purpose	Authorized By *	Used By
1. Addendum to Bulletin 1566, "Regulations for the Implementation of State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs."	State Regulations based upon legislation for developing local programs	SBESE	LEA SDE
2. "Guidelines for Summer School Programs Funded by the State"	Procedures for implementating State funded summer programs	SBESE	LEA SDE
3. "Format for State-Funded Summer School Programs"	a. Procedure for outlining local summer school plan as part of PPP b. Evaluation tool in reviewing local plan	SDE	LEA SDE
4. "Applications for State-Funded Summer School Programs"	On-site monitoring	SDE	SDE
5. Mathematics and Language Arts Class Profile Sheets	To provide assistance to teachers	SDE	LEA
6. Local School System Pre-Monitoring Compliance Report, State-Funded Compensatory/ Remedial Program	a. Checklist for preparing for on-site visit by SDE b. On-site monitoring to verify system compliance with State regulations	SDE	LEA SDE
7. Training Manuals	To provide consistency in monitoring local plans and programs	SDE	SDE
8. State Basic Skills Student Profile Sheet	a. To identify skill deficiencies and mastery of identified skills b. Evaluation	SDE	LEA SDE

As stated previously, the Louisiana Competency Based Education Law which was passed by the 1979 Legislature, required that Pupil Progression Plans be developed at the parish or city school board level. The Act defines a Pupil Progression Plan as "a comprehensive plan developed and adopted by each city and parish school board which shall be based on student performance on the Louisiana Literacy Assessment Program, with goals and objectives which are compatible with the Louisiana Competency-Based Education program and which supplements the minimum standards approved by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, with particular emphasis being placed upon the student's mastery of the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics before he or she would be recommended for promotion or placement, provided that other factors shall be considered." In addition, those students who fail to meet the minimum mastery levels shall be provided with compensatory/remedial education programs, staffed by certified teaching personnel. The Act stipulated the implementation date, provided for the approval of the Pupil Progression Plans by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and provided for implementation by the State Department of Education.

Implementation Activities: Pupil Progression

Following is a detailed description of the development of each of the items in Figure 1 and an explanation of the purpose of the material:

Guidelines for Pupil Progression

In an effort to provide assistance to the local school systems in developing their local Pupil Progression Plans, the State Department of Education developed Pupil Progression Guidelines based upon the requirements in R.S. 17:24.4 (G). Two State Department of Education committees were formed to develop the Guidelines for Pupil Progression. A Coordinating Committee consisting of each assistant superintendent or his designee was established to review, revise, and approve the writing committee's work.

The second committee was the Pupil Progression Guidelines Committee which consisted of representatives from the five major offices in the Department, (Academic Programs, Special Education, Vocational Education, Auxiliary Programs, and Research and Development) and staff members of the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. This committee was charged with the task of developing the Guidelines.

Proposed procedures, timelines, and a budget for the Pupil Progression Guidelines were developed and approved by the Department. Letters and copies of R.S. 17:24.4 were sent to all local school superintendents, and educators throughout the State requesting recommendations and suggestions on the components that should be addressed in the Guidelines. Comments were received and the concerns were considered in the development of the Guidelines. In addition, a request for research on pupil progression was made to the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in Austin, Texas, and Pupil Progression Plans from other states were collected.

The State Department of Education began work on the Pupil Progression Guidelines in August of 1979 and worked for over seven months developing and refining the Guidelines. All of the components specifically addressed in the law were included in the Guidelines as well as other elements that were needed to ensure a comprehensive plan for the placement of grade K-12 students. Every effort was made to develop Guidelines that would provide a degree of consistency throughout the State in regard to pupil placement and yet allow flexibility in the implementation of locally established policies.

From the beginning numerous opportunities were provided to receive input from personnel in the local school systems. During the development of the Guidelines, a selected group of 15 parish educators, including principals, central office staff, and parents was invited to the Department to review the draft of

the proposed Pupil Progression Guidelines and to make recommendations to the Department. Many of the suggestions made by the committee were incorporated into the Guidelines.

After their approval by the State Superintendent's Cabinet, the Guidelines were presented to the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee of the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education for its review and comment. Appropriate changes were made based upon these recommendations. Prior to final approval of the Guidelines, the Department met with the Superintendent's 25-member Advisory Council to review the proposed Pupil Progression Guidelines. Bulletin 1566, Guidelines for Pupil Progression, was officially approved by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education at the March 27, 1980, meeting.

The following areas were addressed within the Guidelines:

Section I General Procedures for Development, Approval, and Revision of a Pupil Progression Plan

- A. Development of a Local Plan
  1. Committee of Educators
  2. Committee of Parents
- B. Description of Committee
- C. Public Notice
- D. Approval Process
  1. State Department of Education/Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Approval

Section II Placement Policies: State Requirements

- A. Regular Placement
  1. Promotion: Grades K-12
  2. Retention: Grades K-12
  3. Compensatory Programs and/or Remediation: Grades K-12
  4. Exceptional Students: Specially Designed Regular Instructional Program

5. Acceleration
6. Transfer Students

B. Alternative to Regular Placement

C. Review of Placements

D. Policies on Records and Reports

E. Policies on Due Process

Section III Placement Policies: Local Option

A. Legislative Guidelines

B. Departmental Guidelines

C. Other Local Option Factors

Appendix A Definition of Terms

A. State Terms

B. Local Terms

Appendix B Chart I, Louisiana Literacy Assessment Programs

Format and Self-Checklist

During the development of the Guidelines, the committees faced a major decision as to whether or not to develop a model Pupil Progression Plan to distribute to the local school systems to use as a guide in developing their local plans. It was felt that the distribution of a model plan would cause the local school systems to rely too heavily on the policies in the model, rather than develop policies and procedures that would best meet their needs. Therefore, in lieu of providing a model plan and in an effort to provide additional technical assistance to local school systems, the Department prepared a format to be followed in developing the Pupil Progression Plan. The format was developed developed as a supplementary tool and was to be used in conjunction with Bulletin 1566, Guidelines for Pupil Progression. Each school system was required to follow this format but was not necessarily limited to the items covered. Page numbers of each of the local plans were to be sequenced according to the format.

The format specified what was to be included on each page of the plan, provided a brief description of how the information should be organized and presented, and referenced the requirements specified in Bulletin 1566.

Many of the local school personnel felt that having to adhere to a prescribed format was very restrictive and unnecessary. However, the format provided continuity among all 66 parish school systems' plans and aided the Department in the review process. In addition, a Local School System Self-Checklist for the Pupil Progression Plan was developed by the Department and was to be completed and returned with the local plans. The Self-Checklist specified on which page in the local plan the required components could be found. The Department used the criteria listed on the Self-Checklist to evaluate the local Pupil Progression Plans.

Technical Assistance

During May of 1980, four regional training meetings were held throughout the State to provide inservice training to the educators in each parish on the requirements of R.S. 17:24.4 and the requirements specified in Bulletin 1566, Guidelines for Pupil Progression. More than 246 educators from 64 school systems participated. At these meetings, persons in the local school systems responsible for the development of the local Pupil Progression Plan were provided an in-depth overview of Competency-Based Education and the role of Pupil Progression in facilitating this effort. The Format and Self-Checklist were reviewed in small group sessions and the specific components that were to be included in each section or area were discussed.

Four State Department of Education technical assistance teams were formed to provide aid to the local school systems in the development of the Pupil Progression Plans. Each of the four teams consisted of five members, representative of each of the five offices in the Department. Team members received in-depth

training on the components of Bulletin 1566, the Format, and the Self-Checklist to provide consistency in the developmental process. From June through December 1980 the Department teams provided technical assistance to local school systems through individual meetings with local personnel either in the parish or at the State Department of Education. In addition, State Department personnel addressed numerous local school boards, educators' groups, and parents to explain the purpose of Pupil Progression.

To further assist local school systems and parents in understanding the components of Pupil Progression, the Bureau of Elementary Education developed and distributed a brochure entitled The Pupil Progression, What It's All About. The brochure consisted of answers to the common questions regarding Pupil Progression. Twenty-five copies of this brochure were sent to each public school.

SDE Review Process and Training of Review Team

Local school systems' Pupil Progression Plans were submitted to the State Department of Education in January, 1981. Four Department review teams were formed, consisting of representatives from each Office. Recognizing a need for providing consistency in the review of the local plans, Department staff conducted an in-depth training session for all reviewers. Training manuals that included an "Evaluation Instrument," to be used by reviewers in reviewing each plan were developed, and procedures, responsibilities, and timelines to be followed by each team were established. The Evaluation Instrument listed every component required in the regulations and referenced each to the format page. This instrument was completed for each parish and served as a checklist to verify that all components were adequately covered in each parish plan. Department team members reviewed the local plans during February and March, 1981. After the departmental review, representatives from each of the 66

school systems met with the Department teams to review the findings in regard to the areas in the local plans that needed to be readdressed. At the conclusion of the negotiation session, local school superintendents were apprised in writing of the Department's concerns. Local school systems were given the opportunity to revise their local plans to be in compliance with the State Guidelines. Local plans were submitted a second time and were reviewed by the respective Department team. In some instances local plans were revised and reviewed two or three times.

During the entire review process, the four team chairpersons met on a regular basis to discuss concerns and to ensure that the plans were being reviewed in a consistent manner.

In June, 1981, all 66 local plans were submitted to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education for approval. Final approval was granted, and local plans went into effect beginning with school year 1981-82.

Interim and Annual Revision

According to Bulletin 1566, Guidelines for Pupil Progression, local plans are to be revised annually. The Department recognized that certain unique situations may arise at the local level which would necessitate a change in the local plan to enable the school system to implement effectively its educational requirements. Therefore, a "Procedure for Interim Revision" was developed and was to be adhered to if changes had to be made prior to the annual revision.

Local school systems are required each year to review and revise (if appropriate) the local Pupil Progression Plans. In the spring of 1982, local school systems were sent the procedures to adhere to in revising the local Pupil Progression Plan along with suggested areas in the plan that may need to be re-

addressed. Technical assistance was provided during the revision process. All 66 school systems were required to revise their entire local plans by June 30, 1982.

In June of 1982, a training session was held for all Department personnel who were responsible for reviewing the revised local Pupil Progression Plans. As in the first year of review, four review teams, consisting of representatives from Academic Programs, Chapter I, Research and Development, and Special Education were established. To provide as much consistency as possible in the review process, team members received a training manual and training regarding the review procedures.

From June through September 1982, the Department review teams evaluated all 66 Pupil Progression Plans. Each local school superintendent was notified in writing of the areas which needed to be readdressed, and appropriate corrections were made by the local school system. The revised local plans were reviewed a second time by the Department review teams prior to recommending approval by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.

On-Site Monitoring of Pupil Progression Plans

To review the status of the implementation of the Pupil Progression Plan at the local level, 13 school systems were visited during the 1981-82 school year. Interviews were conducted at the Central office level and at the school level with both principals and teachers. The entire local plan was reviewed at the central office level, and recommendations were made on areas needing possible revisions. Based upon the responses to the interview questions, each local superintendent was sent, in writing, a list of strengths and areas which needed further consideration. Local school personnel were very

receptive to the suggestions made by the Department, and many of the recommendations were incorporated into the local plan at the time of the next revision. A very positive result of the monitoring visits was the fact that all of the school systems visited were very committed to the implementation of the local Pupil Progression Plan.

Implementation Activites: State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs

R.S. 17:24.4 (Act 750 of 1979 not only required the development of Pupil Progression Plans by each local school system but also mandated the implementation of the Louisiana Literacy Assessment Program that included Basic Skills Testing in Language Arts and Mathematics. A major component of the Competency-Based Education Law was the provision that any student who failed to meet the minimum mastery levels on the State Basic Skills Test was to be provided with compensatory/remedial programs funded by the State.

Although the Compentency-Based Education Law requiring Pupil Progression Plans, Basic Skills Testing, and State-Funded Compensatory/Remediation was passed in 1979, the enabling legislation for the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Education Program was not passed until 1980. R.S. 17:394-400 provided for the allocation of funds for remedial teachers through the Louisiana Minimum Foundation Program. School systems would receive their allocation based upon the number of students who were identified as not meeting the performance standards on the State Basic Skills Tests in Language Arts and/or Mathematics.

Beginning in the fall of 1981, the Department began planning for the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program. Based upon pilot studies of the Basic Skills Tests, the Department determined the approximate number of eligible students for State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Education. In October, 1981,

the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education approved, upon recommendation from the State Superintendent, the minimum performance standards on the State Basic Skills Test. The minimum performance standards were established at 75 percent for mathematics and 75 percent for language arts.

Regulations and Format for State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs

In February of 1982, an Interdepartmental Planning Committee consisting of representatives of all Offices in the Department was appointed by Superintendent Nix to develop regulations for the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs. The Committee worked diligently on the regulations for more than two months, and a final document that corresponded directly with the law was presented to the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee of the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and the State Superintendent's Advisory Council. Because of the numerous concerns expressed by the Advisory Council about implementing the proposed regulations, the regulations were revised and amendments to R.S. 17:394-400 were submitted and accepted by the 1982 Legislature. "The Regulations for the Implementation of State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs" were approved by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education in June of 1982, and copies were submitted to the local school systems. In addition, each school system was sent a format on how the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Education Program was to be developed as part of the Pupil Progression Plan. The format served as one method of ensuring that all components in the regulations were addressed.

As part of its Pupil Progression Plan each local school system is required to develop annually a compensatory/remedial education plan, as part of its local Pupil Progression Plan, that adheres to the State Regulations. "The Regulations

for the Implementation of the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Education Program" specify provisions for funding student eligibility, teacher qualifications, teacher caseload and scheduling, student profiles, coordination with other programs, instruction, student assessment, evaluations, and budgets. Local plans must clearly specify how the compensatory/remedial program will be provided at the local level, and services are to be provided accordingly. Local school systems are allowed the flexibility to initiate a plan that will best meet the needs of the local school system and still adhere to the prescribed State Regulations. The school system's plan for State-Funded Compensatory/ Remedial Education was submitted along with the revised Pupil Progression Plan by each school system in the summer of 1982 and was reviewed as a part of the Pupil Progression Plan.

State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Summer Schools

At the same time Regulations for State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs, Regular School Year were being developed, the Department developed "Guidelines for Summer School Programs Funded by the State" for those school systems offering a State-Funded Summer School program for eligible students. The Guidelines for State-Funded Summer Schools were correlated with the requirements for State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs, Regular School Year. The "Guidelines for Summer Schools Funded by the State" received final approval by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education in June, 1982. The Guidelines and format for developing the summer school plan were distributed to local school systems and systems choosing to offer State-funded summer school programs revised their Pupil Progression Plans accordingly. Local plans for State-funded summer school were reviewed by personnel in the Department, and necessary corrections were made by the local school systems.

Summer School report forms for the State-funded program were developed and distributed to local school system. During the summer of 1982, 33 school systems offered State-funded summer schools for eligible students. Approximately 254 teachers were employed to teach 2,263 students. Supervisors within the Bureau of Elementary Education visited every summer school class in each system to verify information submitted on the Summer School Report form. Each teacher's credentials were checked and during the on site visit, each student's test score(s) on the State Basic Skills Test were verified to determine eligibility to participate in the State-funded program.

To provide additional assistance to the local school systems, class profile sheets for language arts and mathematics were developed as part of the accountability process. The class profile sheets listed each skill addressed on the Basic Skills Test and provided space for the teacher to document when a deficit skill had been taught and mastered. A student profile sheet was developed by the Department and provided for each student who failed to achieve the minimum performance standard on the State Basic Skills Test in Language Arts and/or Mathematics. The Student Profile Sheet listed the students' scores on the Basic Skills Test and tne skill areas in which the student was deficient. The teacher responsible for providing State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Education used this profile sheet to document when the deficit skills were taught and mastered.

Structure of Local Compensatory/Remedial Programs

Based upon the number of students eligible for State-Funded Compensatory/ Remedial Programs, each school system was allocated $350 per student per subject area. The money could be used to provide remediation during the summer, the regular school year, or both. A total of $3,082,050 was allocated for the State-Funded Compensatory/Remediation Program for the summer of 1982 and the 1982-1983 school year.

Although the Regulations for the Implementation of State-Funded Compensatory/ Remedial Programs provides a degree of consistency among all parishes, the type of program being used varies from system to system and school to school in three major areas: teacher type, class type, and schedule type. The following variations are being used in each of the preceding categories.

A. Teacher Type
   - Full time, compensatory education only
   - Part time, compensatory education only
   - Regular Classroom teacher
   - Chapter I teacher
   - Retired teacher
   - Other

B. Class Type
   - In class, compensatory education
   - Pull out, compensatory education
   - Outside school hours

C. Schedule Type
   - Before school
   - After school
   - During planning period
   - During other regular school hours

The majority of the school systems are using more than one type of teacher in a variety of class and schedule types. Several situations necessitated the implementation of a variety of approaches. Some of the problems include:

1. scheduling problems within the parish and the school,
2. logistical problems (distance between schools and travel costs),
3. variation in the number of students per school and the amount of remediation needed,
4. insufficient funding in some areas,
5. lack of certified personnel, and
6. general attitude of the parish in regard to the program.

On-Site Monitoring of State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs

Another major component of R.S. 17:394-400 was the requirement that the Department monitor the implementation of the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program. To provide consistency in the monitoring of the 66 school systems, the Department developed the Local School System Pre-Monitoring Compliance Report: State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program. This form served as a checklist for the local school systems in preparing for monitoring by the Department. The same form was completed by a staff person from the Bureau of Elementary Education during on-site monitoring. All of the questions on the monitoring form corresponded directly to the requirements in the Regulations for the Implementation of State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs, Regular School Year, as well as requirements in R.S.17:394-400. Each question detailed several suggested sources of evidence that could be used to verify the system's compliance with the stated regulation. In addition to the monitoring questions, a teacher information page was included to obtain teacher type, class type, schedule type, teacher certificate number, schools assigned, teaching schedules, and the number of students eligible to be served in each subject area per school. During December, 1982, copies of the Pre-Monitoring Compliance Form were sent to all local program coordinators to prepare for the on-site monitoring visits by the Department.

All 66 school systems were monitored from January through March, 1983. After the initial visit and review at the Central office, visits were made to selected schools. Interviews were conducted with principals, teachers providing the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program, regular classroom teachers, and special education teachers to discuss their involvement in the program. Specific questions on the monitoring forms were directed toward the teacher.

After the on-site visit, letters were sent to the local superintendents with copies to the local compensatory education coordinators listing the noted strengths and the areas which needed further consideration. Listed below are some of the program strengths, areas of concern, and general comments received from local program personnel regarding the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program. These strengths, concerns, and comments will be used in planning and redesigning the compensatory/remedial program for 1983-84.

Program Strengths Cited from Monitoring Visits

1. Documentation was readily available in many systems on all aspects of the compensatory/remedial program.

2. Although not required by the State Department of Education, many systems provided maintenance services to eligible students after students had mastered the identified deficit skills.

3. There was evidence of excellent support and planning by the central office staff with communication and interaction occurring on a regular basis.

4. Personnel involved in the compensatory/remedial program exhibited enthusiasm and dedication in their implementation of the program.

5. Highly qualified compensatory education teachers exhibited success in the removal of Basic Skills Test-identified student skill deficiencies.

6. Record-keeping forms developed at the local level enhanced the implementation of the program.

Areas of Concern Cited from Monitoring Visits

1. In systems in which compensatory/remedial services were provided by Chapter I teachers, care should be taken to ensure that such services do not supplant the required Chapter I services.

2. Consideration should be given to establishing a consistent procedure across all systems for providing maintenance services to students after mastery of their identified deficit skills.

3. As stated in most systems' Pupil Progression Plans, letters informing parents of student placement in and exit from the local compensatory/remedial program should be kept in the student's cumulative file.

4. Consistent procedures should be developed for assessing students' mastery of deficit skills.

General Comments About the State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program from Local Program Staff *

1. Local school staff felt that special education teachers should be allowed to provide compensatory/remedial services to eligible special education students.

2. The time factor involved in the development and implementation of the program was a problem especially in systems that had offered compensatory/remedial summer school.

3. Tracking of students was difficult, both within and between systems.

4. Difficulties were encountered by regular classroom teachers in attaining the required level of coordination among all teachers working with eligible compensatory/remedial students.

5. Teachers were concerned about how to deal with compensatory/remedial students who would not attain the minimum performance standard on the 1983 Grade 2 Basic Skills Test and who would again qualify for compensatory/remedial services.

6. The multiplicity of pull-out programs in which compensatory/remedial students could potentially be involved presented scheduling problems.

7. In systems providing extended day programs, the scheduling of teacher inservice training was difficult.

8. Many compensatory/remedial program coordinators expressed concern that coordination of this program was only one of their many responsibilities and that it required an amount of time that was disproportionate to the number of students served.

9. Several systems were prohibited from offering compensatory/remedial summer school because of transportation problems.

10. Concern was expressed over the growing complexity of the program as additional grade levels are added each year.

11. Concern was expressed over the expenditure of considerable time and money for a relatively low percentage of Louisiana's public school students.

12. Some systems experienced difficulty in locating and hiring qualified teachers.

13. Many systems that held compensatory/remedial summer school programs indicated that they were pleased with the results.

14. Some systems viewed summer school as a way of alleviating the complexity of scheduling multiple pull-out programs for eligible students during the regular year.

15. Several systems indicated that they were very pleased with the performance of their compensatory/remedial teachers.

* Evaluation of the 1982-83 State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program Interim Report: Information Summary, March 1983. (Baton Rouge: Office of Research and Development, Louisiana Department of Education.)

Summary

The development and implementation of the Pupil Progression Plan and State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs have been a very complex responsibility and one that has not been without problems.

These two programs were initiated through legislation and required major educational changes at both the State and local levels. The Department was charged with the task of developing guidelines and regulations for implementing these programs that included the mandates of the legislation and State requirements. At the same time these guidelines and regulations could not lower existing local standards, and had to encourage and emphasize instructional improvements.

The Bureau of Elementary Education was charged with responsibility for managing and coordinating these two components of the Louisiana Competency Based Education Law. From the beginning, every effort was made to provide coordination within the Department by involving all offices in the development of the regulations and in the review process. The interdepartmental committees worked very effectively. However, when the guidelines and revisions were completed, the committees were discontinued. Since Pupil Progression Plans and State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs are ongoing, the need for continued coordination and communication among all offices in the Department still exists, and the interdepartmental committees should be re-established.

The development of Pupil Progression Plans and a State-Funded Compensatory/ Remedial Program was a very time consuming process on the part of both the Department and the local school systems. As is often true with the first year of any new program, the initial reaction to Pupil Progression and State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program was less than positive. The programs were viewed by most school systems as an attempt by the Department to infringe upon local policies and procedures. Local school personnel initially felt that the required guidelines and format were too rigid and that too much time and paperwork were involved. Another major problem with Pupil Progression was the fact that at the same time local school personnel were developing their Pupil Progression Plans they were also implementing and/or developing other major components of the Louisiana Competency Based Education Law. Because personnel in most of Louisiana's school systems were assigned to work with a variety of programs, the manpower necessary to develop a comprehensive Pupil Progression Plan was not available, and school personnel were unable to devote adequate time to develop a quality plan. Therefore, some school personnel were naturally on the defensive during the developmental process and could not envision the long term benefits.

As in the first year of development, some of the local school systems felt the timeline and procedures for the revision process were too strict and were impossible to meet. Since local school systems needed to complete the school year prior to revising the local plan, adequate time was not available for the revision process. If major revisions are made each year, this could continue to be a problem for both the local school system and the Department.

To effectively manage the two programs, the Bureau of Elementary Education had to develop an accountability structure that would provide the necessary checks and balances and that would ensure open and constant communication

with the local school systems. The regulations, guidelines, and supporting materials developed by the Department provided the structure needed for the program to ensure as much consistency as possible throughout the State. throughout the State. Communication, both oral and written, between the Department and the local school systems occurred on a regular basis. The entire accountability structure was very detailed and time consuming, but it was a necessary process.

As stated previously, the management of Pupil Progression and State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Programs was very complex and comprehensive; however, the long term benefits far outweighed the short range problems. Although the initial reaction to these two programs was not very positive, local school systems now react very favorably toward the requirement of a local plan and are very committed to implementing all the requirements. Even if Pupil Progression Plans were no longer required by law, almost all of the school systems have indicated they would continue to implement their local plan. Pupil Progression Plans provide school systems with local, as well as, State accountability in promoting and retaining students. They have also, because of the way in which they are developed, made parents aware of the goals, policies, and procedures of the local school systems.

Another very positive impact of Pupil Progression is the fact that the Pupil Progression Guidelines provided a degree of consistency both statewide and locally for the placement of students while at the same time allowing flexibility for the implementation of local policies at the parish level. For the first time all schools within a system adhered to the same placement policies for all students, K-12.